



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,583	07/01/2003	Ronald P. Doyle	RSW9-2003-0069US1 (7161-9)	6219
46320	7590	03/21/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, PA 200 E. LAS OLAS BLVD SUITE 2040 FT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301			MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,583	Applicant(s) DOYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner Elmira Mehrmanesh	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Doyle et al., for an "Autonomic program error detection and correction" filed July 1, 2003, has been examined.

Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Information disclosed and listed on PTO 1449 has been considered.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cuddihy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,768).

As per claim 1, Cuddihy discloses a method for autonomically diagnosing and correcting error conditions in a computing system (col. 3, lines 39-43) of interrelated components and resources (col. 8, lines 47-55), the method comprising the steps:

For each one of the components (col. 3, lines 49-50), reporting error conditions in a log file using both uniform conventions for naming dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources and also a common error reporting format (col. 4, lines 10-24);

Detecting error conditions (col. 3, lines 55-59) arising from individual ones (col. 3, lines 49-50) of the interrelated components (col. 4, lines 44-59);

Responsive to detecting an error condition in a specific one of the components, parsing a log associated with said specific one of the components to determine whether said error condition arose from a fault in one of the interrelated components (col. 6, lines 34-39) and resources named in said associated log (col. 4, lines 10-32)

And further parsing a log associated with said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said fault (col. 3, lines 57-59) and, correcting said fault (col. 4, lines 33-36, 40-43 and col. 7, lines 47-59).

As per claim 2, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis-code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36) and, utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 57-59).

As per claim 3, Cuddihy discloses activating dormant analysis code (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*) in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition, said dormant analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36) and, utilizing said reported operational data to

identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 57-59).

As per claim 4, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in both said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data for said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36);

And, utilizing said reported operational data to correlate error conditions in each of said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36).

As per claim 5, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis code having a configuration for suspending the operation of said specific one of the components pending resolution of said error condition. Figure 2A shows a log file with *SENDHALT2* and *SEND HALT REPORTING*.

As per claim 6, Cuddihy discloses correcting step comprises the steps of: determining from said further parsing step whether said fault in said one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log arose from an

additional fault in yet another one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 34-44) and, repeating each of the parsing and correcting steps for said yet another interrelated one the components and resources (col. 7, lines 57-59).

As per claim 7, Cuddihy discloses an autonomic system for diagnosing and correcting error conditions (col. 3, lines 39-43) among interrelated components and resources (col. 8, lines 47-55) comprising:

A plurality of commonly formatted log files (col. 3, lines 55-57) utilizing standardized naming conventions for the interrelated components and resources, each of said commonly formatted log files having an association with one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 4, lines 10-24)

And, an autonomic system administrator (Fig. 1, element 12) coupled to each of the interrelated components and resources and configured to parse (Fig. 1, element 26) said log files to identify both error conditions arising in associated ones of the interrelated components and resources (col. 3, lines 55-59), and also dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources giving rise to the identified error conditions (col. 6, lines 34-44 and col. 3, lines 55-59).

As per claim 8, Cuddihy discloses:

A codebase of analysis code (Fig. 1, element 15)

And, code insertion logic coupled to said autonomic system administrator and programmed to insert portions of said analysis code (Figure 3A shows a parsed error

log, *error_code*), in selected ones of the interrelated components and resources.

As per claim 9, Cuddihy discloses analysis code comprises byte code and wherein said code insertion logic comprises byte code insertion logic (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*).

As per claim 10, Cuddihy discloses a machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program (col. 3, lines 32-37) for autonomically diagnosing and correcting error conditions in a computing system (col. 3, lines 39-43) of interrelated components and resources (col. 8, lines 47-55), the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps:

For each one of the components (col. 3, lines 49-50), reporting error conditions in a log file using both uniform conventions for naming dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources and also a common error reporting format (col. 4, lines 10-24);

Detecting error conditions (col. 3, lines 55-59) arising from individual ones (col. 3, lines 49-50) of the interrelated components (col. 4, lines 44-59);

Responsive to detecting an error condition in a specific one of the components, parsing a log associated with said specific one of the components to determine whether said error condition arose from a fault in one of the interrelated components (col. 6, lines 34-39) and resources named in said associated log (col. 4, lines 10-32).

And further parsing a log associated with said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said fault (col. 3, lines 57-59) and, correcting said fault (col. 4, lines 33-36, 40-43 and col. 7, lines 47-59).

As per claim 11, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36) and, utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 57-59).

As per claim 12, Cuddihy discloses activating dormant analysis code in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said dormant analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36) and, utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 57-59).

As per claim 13, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in both said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data for

said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36)

And, utilizing said reported operational data to correlate error conditions in each of said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 3, lines 55-59 and col. 4, lines 33-36).

As per claim 14, Cuddihy discloses inserting analysis code in said specific one of the components responsive to detecting said error condition (Figure 3A shows a parsed error log, *error_code*), said analysis code having a configuration for suspending the operation of said specific one of the components pending resolution of said error condition. Figure 2A shows a log file with *SENDHALT2* and *SEND HALT REPORTING*.

As per claim 15, Cuddihy discloses determining from said further parsing step whether said fault in said one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log arose from an additional fault in yet another one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 34-44) and, repeating each of the parsing and correcting steps for said yet another interrelated one the components and resources (col. 7, lines 57-59).

Related Prior Art

The following prior art is considered to be pertinent to applicant's invention, but nor relied upon for claim analysis conducted above.

Braband et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,477,901), "Directive diagnostics".

Kurosu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,541), "Diagnosing method and apparatus".

Wilner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,909), "Logic analyzer for software".

Jacobson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,690), "Remote automatic diagnostic analyzer for integrated mailing machines".

Pierro (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,659), "Method and system for identifying critical faults in machines".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2113

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Beausoliel".

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100